

## EML QAP Workshop Questionnaire

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Laboratory: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail address: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone/Fax number: \_\_\_\_\_

QAP Labcode: \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ Not currently a QAP participant

### I. NEEDS ASSESSMENT

#### 1. New Matrices

We would be interested in QAP providing PE materials for:

- ☐ Milk — Specify: (Whole, Powdered, Liquid, Ash): \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Biota/tissue — Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Synthetics — Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Other — Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

#### 2. New Nuclides

We would be interested in QAP providing test materials for analysis of:

- ☐ Th ☐ <sup>63</sup>Ni
- ☐ Ra ☐ <sup>55</sup>Fe
- ☐ Np ☐ <sup>99</sup>Tc
- ☐ Other — Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

#### 3. Nuclide Concentration

Are the nuclide concentrations provided by QAP applicable for routine methods employed at your laboratory?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No — Why? \_\_\_\_\_

## **II. Program Service Issues**

### **4. Perception of the Program (Awareness & Value)**

The need for QAP (i.e., an external, independent testing program) is recognized at:

- ☐ The project/field management level
- ☐ The Sample Management Office
- ☐ Lab manager/QA officer level

Our participation in QAP:

- ☐ Adds to the confidence in the quality of analytical results
- ☐ Fulfills DOE QA Program requirement

### **5. Cost Recovery Payment**

If DOE considered a cost recovery scheme, what would you considered to be a fair cost to the participants for the QAP evaluation?

### **6. Evaluation Criteria**

How do you feel about the current QAP evaluation criteria?

- ☐ Keep it as is
- ☐ Change it to \_\_\_\_\_

### **7. Other QAP Services**

Have you used, or are you aware of, services other than the performance evaluation program provided through EML's QAP? I am aware of :

- ☐ Technical Assistance
- ☐ Gamma Spectrometry Intercomparison
- ☐ Source for QC materials
- ☐ Development of Site-specific QC material

### **8. Internal QC materials**

Do you need a source of QC materials?

- ☐ Yes, for methods validation.
- ☐ Yes, for site-specific internal QC.

9. New Materials

We have bulk sample material (55 gal drum) that can be donated to EML for use in QAP (EML will pay for shipping).

- ☐ Soil with nuclide levels above background but below DOT regulations
- ☐ Vegetation
- ☐ Other biota

**III. Reporting Issues**

10. Should QAP introduce standardized error reporting?

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes — The standard be:
  - ☐ One sigma counting error
  - ☐ One sigma combined standard uncertainty (CSU)
  - ☐ Fixed percentage
  - ☐ Standard deviation of replicate analyses
  - ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

11. Should QAP institute reporting of method of analysis?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**IV. Gross Alpha - Gross Beta**

12. Calibration Nuclide

We would like the calibration nuclide to be:

- ☐ Calibrated at EML (not identified) — as in current program
- ☐ Calibrated at EML but identified the nuclide in the QAP Announcement Letter
- ☐ Identify a consensus calibration nuclide

13. Matrices

- ☐ Add soil

14. Nuclide Concentrations

- ☐ Concentration levels are similar to routine analysis
- ☐ Concentration levels should be changed — Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Ratio of alpha/beta are similar to routine analysis
- ☐ Ratio of alpha/beta should be changed — Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

15. Nuclides

- ☐ Continue to use a mix of nuclides determined by EML
- ☐ Use only \_\_\_\_\_ for alpha and \_\_\_\_\_ for beta

**V. Tritium**

16. Preservation - Distillation concerns for LSC analysis

The QAP water sample is a mixed nuclide sample preserved with HCl.

- ☐ Routine analytical method used at my facility can be applied to the QAP sample
- ☐ A separate unpreserved sample should be provided — Specify volume of sample desired:

17. Method Used

Please indicate the method used for your routine tritium analyses:

- ☐ Distillation
- ☐ Prepack column
- ☐ None (direct)
- ☐ Other

Other Issues/Concerns/Comments:

---

---

\*\*\*\*\*

## Future Studies

### I. Strontium

1. ☐ I would be interested in participating in an intercomparison exercise on  $^{90}\text{Sr}$  analysis in soil

### II. QAP Water

2. ☐ I would be interested in participating in a round-robin test of a new water sample

### III. Technetium-99

3. ☐ I would be interested in participating in an intercomparison exercise on  $^{99}\text{Tc}$  analysis in soil and/or vegetation

\*\*\*\*\*

## Current QA Issues

1. National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Conference (NELAC)  
Should QAP consider accreditation as a Performance Testing (PT) Provider under NELAC?
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Am not familiar with NELAC
2. Traceability
- ☐ Current traceability through SRMs to NIST is sufficient
- ☐ Would prefer a direct traceability program provided by NIST (i.e., NRIP)
- ☐ Would like to see implementation of ANSI 42.23, Measurement and Associated Instrumentation QA for Radioassay Laboratories, with traceability through a reference laboratory

send results, replies or questions to [qap@eml.doe.gov](mailto:qap@eml.doe.gov)

\*\*\*\*\*

## EML Gamma Spectrometry Evaluation Program

- ☐ Please send me information about this program.

---

---

---

E-mail: 

---

For current participants: Please provide input on the following issues.

1. Software

Add the following software: 

---

2. Nuclides of Interest

Please list routine gamma nuclide analysis at your facility:  $^{137}\text{Cs}$ ,  $^{60}\text{Co}$ ,  $^{40}\text{K}$ , ....

---

3. Frequency

☐ Once per year (current schedule) is sufficient

☐ Increase to twice per year

☐ Decrease to once every two years

4. Program Mandate

☐ Remain a voluntary program

☐ Seek requirement for participation by DOE labs and contractors

5. Report

☐ Would be interested in a downloadable report (Adobe Acrobat) from the EML web site

6. Provide any ideas for future spectra or measurement problems which could be addressed:

---

---

Questions? Contact: Karin Decker (kdecker@eml.doe.gov)

\*\*\*\*\*

send results, replies or questions to [qap@eml.doe.gov](mailto:qap@eml.doe.gov)